



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,401	08/19/2003	Raymond G. Freuler	POWRD-015C	3992
7590	10/26/2005		EXAMINER	
Steven C. Bauman HENKEL CORPORATION Legal Department 1001 Trout Brook Crossing Rocky Hill, CT 06067			NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1772		
DATE MAILED: 10/26/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/643,401	FREULER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patricia L. Nordmeyer	1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 16-28 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 16-28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawn Rejections

1. The 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph rejection of claims 16 – 28 in the paper dated June 6, 2005 is withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment in the paper dated August 26, 2005.
2. The obvious double patenting rejection of claims 16 – 28 in the paper dated June 6, 2005 is withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment in the paper dated August 26, 2005.
3. The 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 16 – 18 as anticipated by Freuler et al. in the paper dated June 6, 2005 is withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment in the paper dated August 26, 2005.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 16 – 28 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7, 8 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,616,999 to Freuler et al. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Freuler et al. discloses a thermal interface positionable at a juncture between an electronic component and a heat sink for facilitating heat transfer from said electronic component to said heat sink comprising a generally planar substrate consisting essentially of a single layer having first and second surfaces and defining a first continuous peripheral edge, said peripheral edge having a portion thereof extending beyond the juncture between said electronic component and said heat sink, a first layer of heat conductive composition formed substantially about said first surface of said substrate and a second layer of a heat conductive composition formed substantially about said second surface of said substrate, said first and second layer further being formed upon said portion of said substrate extending beyond said juncture between said electronic component and said heat sink and formulated to have a melting point of approximately 51 – 60 °C and a layer of adhesive formed upon a portion of a respective one of said layer of heat conductive material, said adhesive layer being localized upon said portion of said peripheral edge defined by generally planar substrate extending beyond said juncture between said electronic component and said heat sink, wherein said heat conductive composition comprises 60 to 90% by weight of paraffin and 10 to 40% by weight of graphite (Column 8, line 48 to Column 9, line 10) as in claims 16, 20 and 24 – 26. With regard to claims 17, 18, 21, 22, 27 and 28, the substrate comprises a thermally conductive metal foil selected from the group consisting of

copper gold, silver and aluminum (Column 10, lines 1 – 5). A peel-away protective layer formed to said adhesive, wherein peeling away said peel-away layer exposes said layer of adhesive on said substrate so as to facilitate adhesive bonding of said thermal interface to said heat sink (Column 10, lines 18 – 23) as in claims 19 and 23.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16 – 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 7:00-4:30 & alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patricia L. Nordmeyer
Examiner
Art Unit 1772

pln
pln


HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
1772

10/24/05